26/2

PATENTS

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

SEP 1 2 2005

Hause, et al.

Confirmation No. 6218

Group Art Unit: 2612

Serial No.: 10/025,948

Examiner: Jacqueline B. Wilson

Filed: 12/19/01

Docket No. 401802-1010

For:

METHOD OF IMPROVING A SIGNAL IN A

SEQUENCE OF IMAGES ACQUIRED WITH A DIGITAL

COLOR VIDEO CAMERA

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner has made some broad conclusory statements in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance, which may be viewed as an oversimplification of the examination issues, and if taken out of context, could give rise to an improper interpretation of the claims as well as the file history. For these reasons, Applicants provide the following comments to vouch the record and to ensure proper interpretation of the claims and history.

First, while Applicants agree with the Examiner that the stated reasons for allowance of the claims may be proper grounds for allowance, there may be other additional reasons why these claims are allowable over the prior art of record, and Applicant does not admit that the stated reasons for allowance are the only reasons for allowance.

Second, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. Section 282: Each claim of a patent (whether in independent or dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent

upon an invalid claim. Thus, the dependent claims that were not addressed by the Examiner in the reasons for allowance should not rise or fall, when construed in terms of validity, with their respective independent claims, but instead should be construed independently of their respective independent claims.

Third, the scope and validity of each claim (whether in independent or dependent form) should be determined based upon the entire combination of elements/features/steps in each claim, as opposed to only the particular feature or features pointed out by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Paul Qualey, Reg. No. 43,024

Attorney for Applicant

Date:

065005

Docket: 401802-1010